IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 486 of 1990

with

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 3806 to 3815 of 1990

with

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 1672 of 1990

with

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 3798 to 3805 of 1990

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE AKSHAY H.MEHTA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

SURESHKUMAR RAMABHAI TURI

Versus

BANASKANTHA DISTRICT PANCHAYT

Appearance:

MR BN PATEL for Petitioner No. 1

MR BP JOSHI for Respondent No. 1-3

MR AD OZA G.P. for Respondent No. 4

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE AKSHAY H.MEHTA

Date of decision: 05/09/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. In these petitions the grievance made by the petitioners is that though they have been selected for the post of Primary Teacher, the vacancies are not filled in and the select list is not being operated. They have therefore, prayed in this petition that respondents be directed to fill-up the vacancies in the cadre of primary teachers by giving regular appointments to the candidates from amongst the selectees as per the select list which has been annexed to this petition at annexure-B. All these petitions have been admitted vide order dated 23rd August, 1990 and interim relief was granted to the effect that the respondents should not cancel the select list so far it included the reserve categories.

2. Today, when the matters are called out for hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners states that he has received no instruction from his client despite his having intimated to them about the hearing of these petitions.

3. According to him considering the facts involved in these petitions and the period that has uptill now elapsed, the petitioners do not seem to be interested any longer as the cause appears to have become infructuous. In view of that, these petitions are disposed of as having become infructuous. The petitioners are however, granted liberty to revive these petitions in case of any difficulty. The petitions are, therefore, dismissed. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs. Interim relief granted earlier stands vacated.

[AKSHAY H. MEHTA, J.]

/phalguni/